

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/664,381	SMITH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Russell M Kobert	2829	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Russell M Kobert. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Judith Szepesi. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 10 September 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: N/A.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' attorney, Ms. Judith Szepesi contacted the Examiner of Record to inquire if the pending Restriction requirement was intended to be applied to the instant application as it is not clear how to read the pending claims on the identified species. After reviewing the Restriction requirement mailed on August 12, 2004, the examiner informed Ms. Szepesi that the Restriction may not be applicable as intended and a revised Office Action may be necessary. On Monday, September 13, 2004, the Examiner contacted Applicants' attorney, Ms. Szepesi, and informed her that the requirement to Elect has been withdrawn.